Fiscal Estimate - 2011 Session

×	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplemental
LRB	Number	11-3802/2		Intro	duction Numb	er A	B-0599
	planning for a		out-of-home care		ng concurrent perm or such a child	anency	goals, trial
Fiscal	Effect						
		Existing tions Existing	Revenue	es e Existing	to abso		s - May be possible n agency's budget No s
	No Local Gov Indeterminate 1. Increase Permiss 2. Decrease	e Costs sive 🔲 Mandate	3. Increase ory Permissi 4. Decrease	ve 🔲 Mar e Revenu	ndatory	ment Un vns [unties [iits Affected Village Cities Others WTCS Districts
l	Sources Affe		PRS SEC	G 🔲 SE	Affected Ch. EGS	20 App	ropriations
Agend	cy/Prepared I	Ву	Aut	horized	Signature		Date
DCF/ Nick Bubb (608) 266-5422 Rob			Rot	ert Nikola	ert Nikolay (608) 261-4349		

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DCF 3/2/2012

LRB Number	11-3802/2	Introduction Number	AB-0599	Estimate Type	Original					
Description Case planning for a child placed in out-of-home care, including concurrent permanency goals, trial reunifications, and planned permanent living arrangements for such a child										

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under current law, for each child in out-of-home care, the agency responsible for providing services to the child must complete a permanency plan. The permanency plan must describe the end-goal of a child's stay in out-of-home care. Those goals include a safe return of the child to his or her home, placement for adoption, placement with a guardian, placement with a fit and willing relative, or an alternative placement – such as sustaining care, independent living, or long-term foster care.

This bill changes the term "permanency plan" to "case plan" and makes certain other changes relating to case planning for a child placed in out-of-home care, including changes relating to: concurrent planning; trial reunifications; and alternative permanent placements.

This bill clarifies the ability of an agency to use concurrent planning. Concurrent planning is defined as working simultaneously towards achieving more than one permanency goal for a child.

Under current law, the juvenile court may order a change in placement for a child placed outside of his or her home. This bill provides a similar procedure under which the juvenile court may order a trial reunification. A trial reunification is the return of a child, who was removed from his or her home, for a brief period of time, in order to determine if the reunification is appropriate for the child.

Under current law, a permissible goal in a child's permanency plan is an "alternative permanent placement." This bill changes the term "alternative permanent placement" to "other planned permanent living arrangement" and eliminates independent living as a permissible "other planned permanent living arrangement." Further if an agency determines that "other planned permanent living arrangement" is in the best interest of a child it must include the compelling reason for such an arrangement in the child's case plan and include another permanency option in the child's case plan.

It is unclear to what extent these procedural changes are expected to create additional administrative demands on county child welfare agencies or the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare.

The changes in this bill may bring children in out-of-home care placements to permanency in a more timely manner, which may reduce long-term spending on out-of-home care placements. The extent of the long-term savings cannot be predicted.

In April 2010, Wisconsin's child welfare system participated in the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) by the Federal Department of Health and Human Services' Administration for Children and Families (ACF). In response to the CFSR, Wisconsin was required to develop a Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to address the concerns raised in the review. Noncompliance with the initiatives established in the state's PIP will result in ACF withholding federal funds. These legislative changes are included in the Department's approved Program Improvement Plan. Failing to pass these changes could result in federal penalties.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications